

SEP 12 2008

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PEDRO ALEJANDRO GONZALEZ-
MORALES; et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney
General,

Respondent.

No. 07-74315

Agency Nos. A75-708-685
A75-708-686

MEMORANDUM^{*}

On Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted September 8, 2008 ^{**}

Before: TASHIMA, SILVERMAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Pedro Alejandro Gonzalez-Morales, and Maria Isabel Orocio Gonzalez,
natives and citizens of Mexico, petition pro se for review of a decision of the Board

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without
oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

of Immigration Appeals ("BIA") upholding an immigration judge's order denying their application for cancellation of removal.

We lack jurisdiction to review the discretionary determination that petitioners have failed to show exceptional and extremely unusual hardship to their qualifying relatives. *See Romero-Torries v. Ashcroft*, 327 F.3d 887, 891 (9th Cir. 2003). Petitioners' contention that the IJ and the BIA failed to adequately consider and weigh all the evidence of hardship does not raise a colorable due process claim. *See Martinez-Rosas v. Gonzales*, 424 F.3d 926, 930 (9th Cir. 2005) ("traditional abuse of discretion challenges recast as alleged due process violations do not constitute colorable constitutional claims that would invoke our jurisdiction.")

PETITION FOR REVIEW DISMISSED.